'Packed with Patristic Testimonies': Severus of Antioch and the Reinvention of the Church Fathers

Yonatan Moss*

Introduction: A New Way of Writing Theology

Sometime in the mid 520s CE, Severus, central leader of the anti-Chalcedonian movement and former patriarch of Antioch, in a treatise against Julian, former bishop of Halicarnassus, wrote:

> Everyone in the great, Christ-loving Alexandria recognized that the letter which I wrote to him was in fact mine. It was, as one would say, packed with patristic testimonies, down to the very last word (ܟܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܫܕܪ ܟܬܒ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܩܕܝ̈ܫ̈ܐ ܡܫܬܘ̈ܢ ܥܕ ܒܬܪ ܚܕ ܐܝ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ). This being my preferred mode of procedure when composing a written inquiry or when it is a matter of dogma that is at stake.[1]

* I wish to thank Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony and Lorenzo Perrone for inviting me to present this paper and for warmly receiving me into the group. I benefitted tremendously from the many insightful comments of the conference participants. I also wish to thank Christopher Beeley and Christine Hayes for reading through the paper and offering valuable suggestions.

[1] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, II. 1 (1969), pp. 5–6 (trans. p. 4.). All translations are mine unless otherwise indicated. This quote is taken from Severus's treatise *Contra additiones Juliani* (*Clavis patrum Graecorum*, III, no. 7029), which may be dated to sometime between 524 and 527. The *terminus post quem* may be established by Severus's reference, in an earlier letter, to Philoxenus of Mabbug as 'of blessed memory'.

Yonatan Moss is a postdoctoral fellow at the Martin Buber Society of Fellows at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He has recently completed his PhD dissertation, entitled *In Corruption: Severus of Antioch on the Body of Christ*, in the department of Religious Studies at Yale University. He has published a range of articles on Christian and rabbinic cultures in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

Between Personal and Institutional Religion: Self, Doctrine, and Practice in Late Antique Eastern Christianity, ed. by Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony and Lorenzo Perrone, CELAMA 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 227–250 BREPOLS PUBLISHERS 10.1484/M.CELAMA-EB.1.100746

With these words Severus provides a self-evaluation of his writing style. Anyone who has had occasion to engage with Severus's work would probably agree with this self-evaluation. His writings are indeed 'packed with patristic testimonies'. Reading Severus is like reading a symphonic score: the pages are crowded with a vast orchestra of voices from the patristic past; numerous quotations culled from dozens of different post-scriptural authors: Ignatius, Irenaeus, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, John Chrysostom, Cyril, Timothy Aelurus — to name just a few. Although such a concentrated and articulated appeal to one's theological forebears became the norm in later generations; in Severus's day it was still a relative novelty, something that Severus could confidently assert was his own idiosyncratic trademark.[2]

Severus of Antioch was one of the Eastern church's early participants in a process that Patrick Gray has called the 'Canonization of the Church Fathers'.[3] Gray describes this process as one that transformed theology from an enterprise that worked with ideas into one that worked with authoritative sources.[4] Severus articulates his notion of the source and nature of patristic authority at several points throughout his writings. I cite one emblematic statement from one of his letters to Julian:

Philoxenus's death is dated to 10 December 523, for which see: Mingana, 'New Documents on Philoxenus of Hierapolis', p. 156, n. 20, and Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure*, p. 67, n. 4. The *terminus ante quem* is April 528, the date in the colophon to Paul of Callinicus's Syriac translation of the Severus-Julian dossier or, rather, several months before, given the time it would have taken for Paul to receive and translate all the material (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Syr. 140, fol. 145[b]). This 524–27 range pushes the beginning of the whole debate to several years later than the *c*. 520 date postulated by Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse*, pp. 24–25, a date followed in all subsequent studies, e.g. Destephen, *Prosopographie chrétienne*, III: *Diocèse d'Asie (325–641)* (2008), p. 554.

[2] See Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch*, p. 95, for a modern assessment of Severus's writing style.

[3] Gray, '"The Select Fathers"'; as well as Gray, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress'; and Gray, 'Down the Tunnel with Leontius of Jerusalem'. See also Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, pp. 61–66. My focus here is only on the Eastern church. The development of patristic argumentation in the West followed a different course: See Vessey, 'The Forging of Orthodoxy'; Rebillard, 'A New Style of Argument'.

[4] Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', pp. 29–30. At one point Severus himself puts it this way: 'I have said nothing emanating from myself: rather I have cited the teachings of the saints who have successively taught, in an orthodox manner, the word of the true faith'. Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), p. 278 (trans. p. 213). Elsewhere, Severus portrays his opponent's reading of the Church Fathers as an act of parricide: p. 303 (trans. p. 234). It is compliance with authority, less the ideas themselves, that is at stake.

> When I speak of the teachings of the Fathers I actually mean the teachings of God — he who speaks through them [...]. Since you and I equally strive to prove that these same Fathers do not contradict one another, nothing can prevent us from investigating their statements with care and from realizing how they come out as never contradicting themselves or one another.[5]

Severus treated the writings of his theological forebears as canon: they were divinely inspired, inerrant, devoid of all contradictions, and, as I intend to show, they were a-historical.[6] Marking a sharp departure from earlier tradition, Severus rejected all appeals to the notions of historical change and rhetorical embeddedness in his interpretation of the Fathers.

Severus's canonization of the Fathers may be re-described as a form of exegetical institutionalization. Like the church councils that served to enact unanimity among groups of contemporary theologians, Severus's writings served to enact unanimity among a constructed community of past theologians. In Severus's trans-generational institute of Church Fathers only certain members were included,[7] and only certain modes of citation from and interpretation of these fathers were allowed.[8] There was to be no disagreement: the authors of patristic texts could not disagree with one another, and the readers of patristic texts could not disagree with what they read. This was a new mode of doing theology.

In contrast to Severus's institutionalizing conception of the fathers we may cite, by way of example, the words of Cyprian of Carthage in the Acts introducing the North African council of September 256 CE:

[5] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), p. 13 (trans. p. 10). See also pp. 114–115 (trans. p. 88). In the first of these passages Severus goes on to demonstrate his method of resolving contradictions from biblical exegesis. He resolves the apparent contradiction between the respective attitudes of James (e.g. James 2. 26) and Paul (e.g. Galatians 2. 16) toward faith and works as referring to two distinct situations: before and after baptism. See more below on Severus's application of 'interpretive distinctions' to his interpretation of the Fathers. For an analysis of Severus's exegetical method of resolving contradictions in the Gospels, see Roux, *L'exégèse biblique dans les Homélies Cathédrales*, pp. 78–96.

[6] For the de-historicization of the fathers, see also Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', pp. 26–27.

[7] Thus, for example, Severus stipulates that only bishops may be cited as Church Fathers: Severus of Antioch, *Oratio prima et secunda*, ed. and trans. by Lebon, III (1938), p. 244 (trans. pp. 179–80).

[8] Severus frequently criticizes his opponents for selectively citing from the fathers and interpreting them out of context: e.g. Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), p. 263 (trans. p. 202); II. 1 (1968), p. 80 (trans. p. 67).

> It remains, that each one of us should put forth what he thinks about this same matter, judging no one for having a different opinion, nor excluding anyone from the right of communion. For neither has any of us appointed himself a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does anyone pressure his colleagues to the necessity of obedience, inasmuch as every bishop, by right of his own liberty and authority, possesses his own power of judgment and no more may he be judged by someone else than he may himself judge someone else.[9]

Contrary to Severus's portrayal of theology as a masterpiece of conformity, Cyprian put forth an image of theology as an exercise in personal discretion.[10] Certainly, there were important developments in the mode of theological argumentation between the third and sixth centuries, particularly under the influence of the conciliar culture of the fourth and fifth centuries.[11] But Severus, with his emphasis on the complete unanimity of the Fathers, marks a new stage in the process of patristic canonization.

Viewed in comparison with Cyprian, Severus does indeed seem to present an extremely institutionalized version of theology, one that leaves no room for individual differences between theologians. But although individualism is absent from Severus's exegetical rhetoric, Severus's exegetical practice tells a different story. I hope to show that Severus's very quest to enshrine the fathers in institutional unity inevitably led him to engage in some very idiosyncratic readings of those same fathers. Or, to use the terminology Menachem Fisch has employed to describe the exegetical relationship of the Babylonian Talmud (the Bavli) with its authoritative past,[12] Severus's extreme *traditionalism* entailed a

[9] Cyprian of Carthage, *Sententiae Episcoporum*, ed. by Diercks, pp. 5–7. For a discussion of this council within the context of the mid-third-century conflict over rebaptism, see Burns, *Cyprian the Bishop*, pp. 100–31. See, in fuller detail, Bernardini, *Un solo battesimo una sola chiesa*. I owe this reference to Lorenzo Perrone.

[10] Cyprian's rhetoric of theological plurality was not necessarily reflective of reality. The Acts tell of a council in which all bishops present reached the same conclusion. The weight of Cyprian's remark here was aimed against his opponent, Stephen of Rome. Cyprian knew to demand authority over other bishops when he thought the situation demanded it. See Burns, *Cyprian the Bishop*, pp. 152–65. See further, Lim, *Public Disputation*. Lim traces a shift in Christian attitudes toward public, oral debate between the third and fifth centuries. My argument here follows a parallel course but focusses on texts rather than on oral debate.

[11] See Studer, 'Argumentation, Patristic'; Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter*.

[12] Fisch, *Rational Rabbis*. For a more recent articulation (partially in response to his critics), see Fisch, 'Parshanut dekhuka ve'tekstim makhayvim'. See also the *Journal of Textual Reasoning*, 4. 2 (2006), an entire issue devoted to Fisch's book.

no less pointed *anti*-traditionalism. Later on I will return to this comparison between Severus and the Bavli.

The Controversy between Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus

For the purposes of this paper I will be limiting my discussion to one group of writings within Severus's large corpus. The writings in question are those relating to the polemic with Julian of Halicarnassus regarding the incorruptibility of the body of Christ. My focus here is less on the content of the debate than on its form. I am interested in the ways in which the rhetoric and exegesis of Severus and of Julian, to the extent the writings are available, respectively shaped and negotiated the authority of their theological predecessors, the men they call their 'fathers'.

To do this I shall first briefly recall the debate's historical and theological background. Since the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE, the Christian East had been bitterly divided between the supporters and opponents of the Council. The Council of Chalcedon had defined that Christ united within him two natures, one human and one divine, while opponents of the Council defined only one, hypostasized nature. The anti-Chalcedonian party had enjoyed a period of favour under the emperor Anastasius, but this period came to a close with the rise of Anastasius's successor, Justin I, in 518 CE. Immediately following his rise to power, Justin began a prolonged campaign against the anti-Chalcedonian party. Bishops across the East who were unwilling to sign a Chalcedonian statement of faith were compelled to leave their sees. Many fled to Egypt, an anti-Chalcedonian stronghold.[13]

Two such men were Severus and Julian, who under the reign of Anastasius had been, respectively, patriarch of Antioch and bishop of Halicarnassus. Severus and Julian shared a strong commitment to the anti-Chalcedonian cause, but there developed between them an acrimonious theological dispute about the body of Christ. Julian advanced the idea that from the very moment of incarnation Christ's body was not subject to corruption. He saw the incarnation as the focus of the salvation of humanity. By coming into the world with an incorruptible body such as Adam and Eve had had before their fall, Christ granted humans the possibility of returning to their original state of bodily incorruptibility. Severus countered that to claim that Jesus's body was incor-

[13] Three exemplary studies of the period are: Vasiliev, *Justin the First*; Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*; Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*.

ruptible was a diminishment of his humanity. According to Severus, the body of Christ became incorruptible only after his resurrection from the dead, and it is only in the future, general resurrection that ordinary human bodies will attain incorruptibility.[14]

Severus and Julian wrote in Greek, but their works survive almost exclusively in Syriac translation. Since it was Severus's followers who ultimately prevailed, far more survives from Severus's side of the debate than from Julian's side.

May a Father Change His Mind? Two Different Approaches to Patristic Authority

Having called to mind the background to the debate between Severus and Julian, let us now take a closer look at how these two authors related to their patristic past. Earlier on Severus's notion was noted that patristic writings must be devoid of all contradiction. Given the wide range of authors included under Severus's rubric of 'Church Fathers', his project of reading *all* of the fathers as speaking in one voice posed a formidable hermeneutical challenge. It was the role of the theologian, heir to this patristic heritage, to harmonize all contradictory passages within the canon. But how was this done? The differing approaches of Severus and Julian to this problem offer us a window on the difference between Severus's new, 'reinvented' view and the more traditional view of the Fathers.

Within the longstanding Chalcedonian debate of Late Antiquity the legacy of no single Church Father was more hotly contested than that of Cyril of Alexandria. Both sides claimed Cyril as their own.[15] This state of affairs was made possible by the fact that over the course of his career Cyril does indeed seem to have changed his mind, or at least his mode of expression.[16] In texts

[14] The most thorough study of the controversy remains Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse*. See also the review of Draguet's book by Casey, 'Julian of Halicarnassus', and Moss, 'In Corruption: Severus of Antioch on the Body of Christ'.

[15] See Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, pp. 124, 208; Gray, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress', pp. 287–88; Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 5, 296–302; Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, pp. 64–66. See also Grillmeier and Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II. 2, pp. 22–23; 28–46.

[16] Gray, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress', p. 287 and Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 266–67, 277–78, take the former view, that Cyril actually changed his mind; McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 112, 228, by contrast, interprets the apparent inconsistencies in Cyril's Christology as different expressions of an essentially consistent position. Frend, *The*

written in the context leading up to the Council of Ephesus in 431, Cyril asserts one nature in Christ and explicitly denies two natures.[17] But in the context of his reconciliation with the Eastern churches, which culminated in 433, Cyril speaks of the union of two natures in Christ.[18] Already in his own day there was some confusion as to what Cyril's true opinion was.[19] Cyril himself addresses this apparent contradiction. In a series of letters written in the course of the 430s he explains that Christ unifies within himself the divine and human natures, such as an ordinary man unifies within himself the two natures of soul and body. But just as the soul and body of man are distinct only on the level of mental conception, whereas in practice they both belong to one man, so are the two natures of Christ distinct only at the level of mental conception, while in practice Christ is one.[20] As for his earlier statements about the *one* nature of Christ, Cyril explains these as intentional exaggerations designed to provide a dramatic counterpoint to Nestorius's notion of two *distinct* natures in Christ.[21]

Cyril resolves the apparent contradictions within his work not as a pious exegete of inherited tradition but as a man anxious to defend the consistency of his own thought. Julian of Halicarnassus, writing a century later, revered Cyril

Rise of the Monophysite Movement, p. 121, suggests attributing the ambivalences in Cyril's Christology to his exposure to the contradictory influences of earlier theologians. In line with Frend's suggestion, Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen', expertly traces the shifting and competing influences of Athanasius and Gregory Nazianzen on Cyril's Christology.

[17] For example, Cyril of Alexandria, *De recta fide ad augustas*, 1. 10, PG 76, col. 1212A; Cyril of Alexandria, *De recta fide ad augustas*, ed. by Schwartz, 1.10, p. 65. See McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 207–12.

[18] In an epistle to John of Antioch, Cyril subscribes to the Eastern formula of reunion that includes the words: 'δύο φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονεν' ('there was a union of two natures'). Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, PG 77, no. 39, col. 177A; Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, ed. by Schwartz, no. 39, I. 1. 4, p. 17.

[19] At one point Cyril had to write to his agents in Constantinople to dispel their impression that he gone over to the other side: Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, PG 77, no. 37, col. 160C; Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, ed. by Schwartz, no. 37, I. 1. 7, p. 154. See McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 116–17.

[20] Second Letter to Succensus: Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, PG 77, no. 46, col. 245A; Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, ed. by Schwartz, no. 46, I. 1. 6, p. 162. For a history of the Christological applications of the 'anthropological paradigm' and its philosophical background, see Lang, *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon*, pp. 101–57. Cf. Beeley, 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen', pp. 395–96.

[21] Epistle to Acacius of Beroea; Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistolæ*, ed. by Schwartz, no. 33, I. 1. 7, p. 149; trans. in McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*, p. 340.

as a Church Father. Nevertheless, he approaches Cyril's apparent shift of opinion in the same manner as Cyril himself did.

> I did not agree to speak after the Union of the properties of activities and natures. Also in this I have followed the intention of the blessed Cyril. For it is he who 'cures' his own writing (ܣܗܕܘܬܗ ܕܟܝܪܘܣ) on this matter and states that these things come under the denotation of 'nature' only by means of the subtlety of thought and the imaginations of the mind.[22]

Julian alludes to Cyril's second letter to Succensus,[23] written to clarify his position to his traditional allies. It is for this reason that Julian describes Cyril's activity as a form of 'literary curing'. Writing to his old colleagues from the Nestorian controversy, Cyril sharpens, or, depending on how we understand the word 'cure' here, possibly amends the terms he had used in his reconciliation with the opposing party.[24] Cyril himself, and Julian in his footsteps, accepts the historical situatedness and rhetorical embeddedness of theological expression. Cyril could write one way when countering Nestorius, another way when reconciling John of Antioch, and yet another way when addressing his traditional allies. Differing historical circumstances can serve to resolve apparent theological contradictions.

But Severus found this hermeneutical stance unacceptable. He lambastes Julian for implying that Cyril might have changed his mind:

> He who wrote in every place in agreement with himself, imparting by means of these very same teachings the orthodox doctrine — how could you slander him as one who has made a mistake in one place and has then corrected his mistake in another place and in another writing?[25]

[22] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, II. 2 (1969), p. 285 (trans. p. 251) = Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse*, *22, fr. 61.

[23] See n. 20 above.

[24] Hespel translates: 'en amendant son propre écrit'. Draguet's Greek retroversion reads: 'ἰασάμενος τὸ αὐτῷ γεγραμμένον'.

[25] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, II. 2 (1969), p. 287 (trans. p. 252). Several years later, Justinian makes a similar accusation against Ibas of Edessa, PG 86, col. 1077B: 'Where has the holy Cyril set out the opposite of his former teaching, or where did he change his mind? How did the Holy Synod in Chalcedon set him down as a father if he repented [...]? He who repents is not numbered among the teachers, but is received as one who returns from his wandering ways' (quoted from Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', p. 33, n. 57).

Severus's notion of the Fathers of the Church as divinely inspired conduits of orthodoxy precluded any possibility of historical change or development in their writings. Explanations based on a text's particular circumstances of composition, the author's intended audience or his specific rhetorical needs were off limits. In this respect it was actually Julian, rather than Severus, who was more in line with their shared patristic tradition. In his attempt to defend the integrity of the tradition, Severus broke with a well-established exegetical practice among the fathers. Cyril, as we just saw, explained differences in his writings by distinguishing among different addressees. We find the fourth-century fathers Athanasius and Basil engaging in similar exegetical practices. Basil interprets certain statements by Gregory Thaumaturgus in light of their particular historical and rhetorical contexts. He makes a distinction between dogmatic and controversial settings, and he 'grants' Gregory the rhetorical license to address different audiences in different ways.[26]

Athanasius uses the same methods to resolve contradictions in the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria. In one text Dionysius had written that the Son was made, in another that the Son is co-eternal with the Father. Athanasius resolves the contradiction by positing different contexts for the different texts. Dionysius, according to Athanasius, 'was led to write as he did by the occasion and the person concerned [...]'. He was 'a wise teacher whose practice it is to arrange and deliver his lessons with reference to the characters of his pupils, until he has brought them to the way of perfection'.[27] Different historical circumstances produce different theological emphases.[28]

Thomas Graumann, in his study of fourth-and-fifth century constructions of patristic authority in the Eastern church, has traced the roots of this exegetical mode to Greek rhetorical education.[29] Grammar students were taught to explain various aspects of literary texts by identifying a work's overarching

[26] Basil, 'Letter 210', ed. and trans. by Deferrari.

[27] Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii*, ch. 4, PG 25, col. 485B; ch. 6, col. 488C. See further Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii*, ed. and trans. by Heil, pp. 143–45.

[28] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), pp. 115–16 (trans. pp. 89–90), interestingly quotes from the following two sections (7–8) in Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii*, PG 25, cols 489B–91B. Although Athanasius, in the passage quoted by Severus, continues to advocate for rhetorically informed, audience-based exegesis, Severus puts this passage to a very different use. Reading the passage against its grain, he recruits it as an argument for holistic, intertextual exegesis. Severus ignores the fundamentally historicizing orientation of this passage.

[29] Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter*, pp. 154–61.

purpose. More advanced students of rhetorical declamation were taught to tailor their speeches to specific audiences and occasions. It stands to reason that the technique for resolving textual contradictions regularly practiced by the fathers was derived from the common rhetorical education that they, as writers of good Greek, would have received.[30]

Severus, however, as we have seen, did not go this route.[31] To Severus's dehistoricized view of the fathers the literary-historical approach was anathema. Unlike the literary-historical technique that distinguishes between different historical situations and audiences, Severus's technique makes casuistic, *content*-based distinctions. Statements that appear contradictory are read as referring to two different things. Some patristic texts appear to say that the body of Christ was corruptible, thus supporting Severus's opinion. Other patristic texts appear to say that the body of Christ was incorruptible, thus offering support for Julian's opinion. If, as Severus assumes, all the fathers speak in one voice, the apparently contradictory passages must refer to distinct situations. Severus reads some apparently pro-Julian passages in the fathers as referring not to the incarnate Christ but to the pre-incarnate Logos.[32] He reads other pro-Julian passages as referring to Christ's body, but only *after* its resurrection from the dead.[33] He reads still other passages as referring not to bodily incorruptibility but to moral incorruptibility.[34] Such distinctions undergird Severus's interpretation of the fathers and his whole theological system. He locates them at the heart of his disagreement with Julian:

[30] See more generally Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, pp. 126–37, 190–235, on Cyril's rhetorical background.

[31] Although, as noted by Grillmeier and Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II. 2, p. 72, in an earlier work, Severus did employ literary-historical arguments to explain the appearance of 'two nature' expressions in Cyril and other fathers: Severus of Antioch, *Oratio prima et secunda*, ed. and trans. by Lebon, pp. 1–2. But I disagree with the other claim (Grillmeier and Hainthaler, II. 2, pp. 91–92) that in one place in his anti-Julianist *Apology for the Philalethes*, Severus criticized the fathers and 'allowed' for them to change their minds: Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, III (1971), pp. 83–84 (trans. p. 70). An examination of the passage in question simply does not bear out this claim.

[32] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), pp. 119–22 (trans. pp. 92–94).

[33] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), p. 67 (trans. p. 51); II. 1 (1968), pp. 124–25 (trans. pp. 103–04).

[34] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), pp. 79–80 (trans. pp. 60–61).

> Thus, even when chastised, you do not prefer silence, and you do not learn to distinguish the times [in the life of Christ] and to understand the meaning of the term 'incorruptibility' and what it implies, and [to understand] that the body of Christ was always holy and sinless, but [it was] impassible and incorruptible [only] from the time of the Resurrection [...]. Since you do not understand the subtlety (ܪܗܝܡܘܬܐ) of the wisdom of the Teachers concerning the lessons of the Faith you also do not distinguish the times [in the life of Christ].[35]

Julian, however, adamantly refuses to accept the validity of such distinctions. He writes:

> Speaking of a distinction between two different [kinds of] corruption with reference to the Lord or of [a distinction] between destruction and sin — Divine Scripture does not accept [this], inasmuch as it teaches that sin is the source of all corruption. And Cyril also rejects [this], saying that 'sin is the root [of corruption]'.[36]

Severus's 'Interpretive Distinctions' in Practice: A Case Study

How did Severus's usage of the 'interpretive distinctions' appear in practice? Let us explore one example in greater detail. Cyril, in a letter addressed to female members of the imperial family,[37] employs the notion of Christ's incorruptibility. Cyril describes this incorruptibility as that which led to the restoration of humanity's nature to its original state, before the fall. I quote from the independent tradition of Cyril's Greek text, since, as we shall see, the Syriac version of Severus's citation of this text differs from Cyril's Greek at one crucial point. Cyril writes:[38]

> He himself became, in the manner of humans, perfect in flesh, on our account, while he perfected us, in the divine manner, by destroying the power of death. For incorruptibility was lacking in human nature, although human nature had been, at the beginning, in that state [= of incorruptibility] [...]. *Having perfected us in this manner, he* [=Christ] *said* (οὕτως ἡμᾶς τελειώσας ἔφασκε) to God the Father who is

[35] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, II. 1 (1968), pp. 124–26 (trans. pp. 103–05).

[36] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, II. 2 (1969), p. 275 (trans. p. 241) = Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse*, *22, fr. 60.

[37] For the correct addressees of this letter see Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter*, pp. 324–25.

[38] Cyril of Alexandria, *De recta fide ad augustas*, ch. 25 (31), PG 76, col. 1376B–C; Cyril of Alexandria, *De recta fide ad augustas*, ed. by Schwartz, p. 42. Emphasis mine.

> in heaven: 'I have glorified you on earth; I have performed the work which you gave me to do' (John 17. 4). For God the Father's true glory is the destruction of death by His own Offspring [...].

In this statement Cyril portrays Christ's work as the perfection of humanity, achieved by the restoration of the incorruptibility and immortality that had been the original nature of humanity. Christ is described here as having accomplished this work through the sufferings he experienced in his lifetime. The verse Cyril quotes from John 17, in which Jesus looks back at his life's work, was uttered on the *eve* of the crucifixion. Already then, Cyril's passage seems to say, Jesus had perfected humanity.[39]

This Cyrillian passage poses a challenge to Severus's view that Jesus's body was not incorruptible during his lifetime. Severus therefore reads Cyril's words as referring to the time *after* his resurrection. According to Severus's reading, Cyril's citation of Jesus's statement in John 17, uttered on the eve of his crucifixion, does not apply to the past but looks toward the future.[40] The incorruptibility of both Christ and humanity, according to Severus's reading of Cyril, will happen only *after* the resurrection; but Jesus, inasmuch as past, present and future are all one to him, speaks of the future as if it were the past.[41]

This is an interpretive distinction that Severus applies to the text. However, not only is there no hint in Cyril's words to support this distinction, there are, instead, two words in Cyril's text that actually seem to preclude Severus's reading.

[39] The idea that it was the incarnation that restored incorruption to humanity is a recurrent theme in Cyril's work. At times, however, he assigns this role to the crucifixion. See Meunier, *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, pp. 115–22.

[40] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), pp. 103–104 (trans. p. 80).

[41] Severus of Antioch, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Hespel, I (1964), pp. 104–05 (trans. p. 81), cites the precedent of John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Joannem*, ch. 80, PG 59, col. 435, for this future-oriented reading of John 17. 4. This hermeneutical trope, which reads past-tense descriptions as referring to future events, is rooted in a tradition of Christological exegesis of the Old Testament. See e.g. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, ed. by Marcovich, ch. 114, pp. 265–66; Irenaeus, *Eis epideixin tou apostolikou kerygmatos*, ed. and trans. by Ter Mekěrttschian, Wilson, and Barthoulot, ch. 67, pp. 709–10; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, ed. and trans. by Evans, 3. 5, vol. I, pp. 178–81; John Chrysostom, *Homilia in illud*, PG 51, cols 33A–B. Severus would like to read Cyril as interpreting the verse's reference to a time after the resurrection, but Cyril, in his interpretation of the verse in his earlier *Commentary on John*, explicitly limits the reference to the incarnation and crucifixion: Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannis Evangelium*, ed. by Pusey, 11. 6, vol. II, pp. 676–77.

Severus wishes to read Cyril's description of Christ's perfection of humanity as referring to a state of affairs subsequent to Jesus's death. Although Jesus refers to this while still alive, he does so, according to Severus, prophetically. Cyril, however, at least in the Greek text available to us, introduces Jesus's statement in John 17. 4 with the words: 'οὕτως ἡμᾶς τελειώσας [...]' ('Having perfected us in this manner [...]'). Cyril's use of the aorist participle indicates that he viewed the actual perfection of humanity as something that occurred *prior* to Jesus's statement about it.[42] Thus Jesus's statement could *not* be interpreted as pointing to the future.

Our Syriac version of Severus might reflect an awareness of this problem. For when we compare the current text of Severus with our text of Cyril, we realize that Severus may have solved the problem by a slight emendation. In the Syriac version of Severus's citation from Cyril it does not say: 'having perfected us in this manner', but 'when he performed thus' (حد هحيل هحيكه عجلم). Without the direct object, namely the pronoun 'us' in the words 'having perfected us', the verb *shamli* in Syriac as well as the underlying Greek *teleiow* lose their specific meaning of 'to perfect' and become a more generic verb with the sense of 'perform' or 'accomplish'.[43] By this slight emendation, which in Severus's original Greek would probably have involved only the removal of one word — *hemas*, 'us' — Severus was able to neutralize the one incontrovertible implication in Cyril's text that Jesus granted incorruptibility while still alive. Cyril's text as it now stands in Severus does not necessarily support Severus's reading of it, but, due to what appears to be an emendation on Severus's part, at least it does not *preclude* this reading.

It is possible that Severus was working with a different textual tradition of Cyril's text than those known to us. But if the change between our Greek text of Cyril and the Syriac translation of Severus's citation from Cyril was deliberately introduced by Severus himself, this would fit with the same process of patristic canonization I have been describing. Similar to what Bart Ehrman has called the 'orthodox corruption of Scripture',[44] we may have traces here of the ortho-

[42] There is also the faint possibility that the construction here does not follow the general syntactical principle that the aorist participle denotes an action prior to the main verb. For the rule and its exceptions see Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*, p. 420.

[43] It is precisely this difference between the two meanings of the word *teleiow* that Cyril exploits in his interpretation of John 17. 4. The verse, in speaking of 'the work' Jesus was given to do, uses the word in the sense of 'perform', 'accomplish' ('τὸ ἔργον ετελείωσα ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω'). By adding the pronoun ἡμᾶς in his interpretation of the verse, Cyril recasts the word in its other sense: 'to perfect'. Severus's deletion of the pronoun may be closer to the original wording of the verse, but it obfuscates the meaning of Cyril's interpretation.

[44] Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*.

dox corruption of the fathers. There is, as discussed earlier, a tinge of paradox in this. The more revered a text, the more liable it is to be corrupted.[45] And, as this piece of Severan exegesis demonstrates, the more revered a text, the more liable it is to be *interpreted* in untraditional ways, against its grain, in order to resolve its contradictions and give it contemporary relevance. It is precisely Severus's high regard for the *notion* of Cyril's authority that leads him in exegetical practice to subordinate Cyril's text to his own authority. Severus's institutionalized vision of the Church Fathers is actually what leads him to offer his own individual interpretation of their writings.

Fathers and Sages: Severus, the Bavli, and their Respective Pasts

Turning eastwards from Severus's Alexandria and Antioch, we encounter another textual project emerging at approximately the same time as that of Severus,[46] which demonstrates a similar mix of traditionalist and anti-traditionalist hermeneutics. Major developments in the research of the Babylonian Talmud over the past generation have enabled scholars to distinguish the Bavli's earlier traditions from its later redaction and, as a result, to realize the essential role the redactors played in the production of the text as it now appears before us.[47] When we speak of our impressions of the Bavli's culture, and its underlying textual assumptions, it is, wittingly or not, the work of these redactors that we are referring to.[48]

The Bavli and Severus share the working assumption that all elements within the past tradition must agree with any given opinion expressed in the present. As a result the Bavli and Severus also share the concomitant engagement in the hermeneutical 'readjustment' of past traditions in order to conform to present

[45] See Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', p. 24, and, in more detail, Gray, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress'. See also Daley, 'Boethius' Theological Tracts',p. 172, and n. 55. For a similar point in a different context, see Halbertal, *People of the Book*, pp. 19–26.

[46] For a recent, accessible introduction to the state of the research on the Bavli in the past generation, see Kalmin, 'The Formation and Character of the Babylonian Talmud'. For issues of dating, see pp. 840–43.

[47] See the now classic Halivni, *Meqorot u-mesorot*, II (1975), pp. 1–12; Halivni, *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara*, pp. 76–104; Friedman, 'Pereq haisha rabbah babavli'. For applications of this literary-critical argument to the historiography of the period, see Rubenstein, *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*; Boyarin, *Border Lines*, pp. 151–225; Boyarin, 'Hellenism in Jewish Babylonia'.

[48] See Boyarin, 'Hellenism in Jewish Babylonia', p. 342.

opinions. The Bavli rereads, often against their grain, the disputes of the later rabbis, the amoraim, as solely concerned with matters untouched by the debates of the earlier rabbis, the tannaim.[49] Like Severus, the Bavli usually accomplishes these 'readjustments' by interpretive distinctions and textual emendations.[50]

Examples can be found on virtually every page of the Talmud. Since I have been dealing with the theology of the body, I will cite one talmudic example relating to the body:

> It was stated [introducing a later, amoraic statement]: 'If hot water is heated on the eve of the Sabbath, — Rav said: On the morrow one may wash his whole body in it, limb by limb; while Samuel ruled: They [the Sages] permitted one to wash his face, hands, and feet only'.
>
> An objection [from an earlier, tannatic source] is raised: 'If hot water is heated on the eve of the Sabbath, the next day one may wash his face, hands, and feet in it, but not his whole body'.
>
> This refutes Rav! — Rav can answer you: 'Not his whole body at once, but limb by limb'.
>
> But he [the Tanna from the earlier source] states, 'his face, hands, and feet'! — [Read instead] 'similar to the face, hands, and feet'.
>
> Come and hear [introducing another earlier, tannaitic source]: 'It was permitted to wash only one's face, hands, and feet [on the Sabbath] in water heated on the eve of the Sabbath'! — Here too [read] 'similar to the face, hands, and feet'.[51]

The two tannaitic sources, taken on their own terms, seem clearly to be saying that it is *only* one's face, hands, and feet that one may wash with water heated prior to the Sabbath. One source explicitly states 'but *not* his whole body', and the other source states '*only* one's face, hands, and feet'. This contradicts the opinion of Rav, a later, post-tannaitic amora, that one may wash one's *whole* body, even if only one limb at a time. Rather than updating Rav's view in light of the tannaitic sources, or rejecting it altogether, it is the tannaitic sources that the Talmud

[49] See, e.g. Rubenstein, *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*, p. 35. It should be noted that the Bavli's harmonizing hermeneutic discussed here is far less frequently practiced by its Palestinian counterpart, the Yerushalmi, redacted toward the end of the fourth century. The Yerushalmi is usually content with pointing out the contradictions that earlier traditions pose to later views, without attempting to reinterpret those earlier traditions. See Sussmann, 'Ve-shuv li-Yerushalmi Neziqin', pp. 101–05; Kraemer, *The Mind of the Talmud*, pp. 93–98; Fisch, *Rational Rabbis*, pp. 133–42.

[50] Although the Bavli does also occasionally engage in more literary-historical harmonizations. Hayes, *Between the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds*, pp. 12–13.

[51] Shabbat 40a.

chooses to reinterpret. The redactor reads the tannaitic sources against their grain in order to conform to Rav's opinion, that one may wash one's whole body.

Menachem Fisch uses the terms of 'traditionalism' and 'anti-traditionalism' to describe this aspect of the Bavli's textuality. On the one hand, the Bavli is strongly committed to the tannaitic tradition: it presents the tannaitic sources as the touchstones of legitimacy for later opinions. But like Severus, who reveres his patristic tradition but reinterprets it in light of a contemporary controversy, the Bavli also prefers to reinterpret the tradition in light of more recent opinions, rather than the reverse. Furthermore, like Severus, and unlike Severus's predecessors, the Bavli shies away from *historical* and *rhetorical* explanations in order to resolve apparent contradictions. Harmonization is achieved by means of casuistic interpretive distinctions and textual emendations.[52]

Although similar in their hermeneutic approaches to their respective pasts, Severus's theological treatises and the Bavli also present very different models of textuality. Whereas Severus is the individual author of written texts, produced in relatively short spans of time, the Bavli emerges from the cumulative, oral work of a collective that spans generations.[53] Severus demands complete harmony among all the voices of his patristic past whereas the Bavli presents its rabbinic past as polyphonic. There is no evidence for any direct interaction between Severus and the Bavli's redactors, even if, according to the guess of some scholars, they were contemporaries.[54] How, then, might we account for their similar attitude toward past tradition?

Concluding Hypothesis: A Legalistic Common Denominator?

Rather than viewing the similar hermeneutic orientation of Severus and the Bavli as the result of actual channels of influence, I propose to explore the possibility of a common denominator that would have independently produced the similarities evidenced separately in Severus and the Bavli. The common denominator I propose is Severus's and the Bavli's shared legalistic orientation.[55]

[52] The classic study of the Bavli's harmonizing emendations of its tannatic sources is Epstein, *Introduction to the Text of the Mishnah*, pp. 595–693 (Hebrew).

[53] See Jaffee, 'Rabbinic Authorship' and, in the same volume, Alexander, 'The Orality of Rabbinic Writing'.

[54] Severus of Antioch, *Oratio prima et secunda*, ed. and trans. by Lebon, III (1938), p. 244 (trans. p. 179), mentions a visit of his to Mesopotamia; but this would have been to the northern part of Mesopotamia subject to his diocese, not to the centres of Talmudic culture further south.

[55] After having completed writing this article I came across Roux, 'The Concept of

The Bavli's legalistic orientation is clear enough: virtually all discussions about the relation between earlier and later sources take place in legal settings. The primary concern of the Talmud and the discussions it reflects is jurisprudential.

Severus's legalistic orientation is manifested not so much in his subject matter as in his biography. We learn about Severus's five years of law studies in Beirut from his friend and biographer Zachariah Scholasticus. Prior to his baptism Severus was enamoured of Roman law. During this period Severus dedicated himself to legal studies Monday through Friday, and it was only over the weekends that he first began to study the writings of the Church Fathers. By the time he completed the programme Severus had composed and left for posterity a work of comparative Roman legal interpretation.[56] According to another biographer, also a contemporary of Severus's, Severus was elected a professor (*antecessor*) at the Beirut academy.[57] No copies of Severus's legal treatise survive, but we may postulate that it involved the same kind of exegetical methodology of 'interpretive distinctions' that Severus introduced into his exegesis of the fathers later in his career.[58] This type of casuistic scholasticism was characteristic of late antique Roman jurisprudence in general and of the course of studies at the Beirut law school in particular. Beirut's fourth-year students were known as *lytae* (λύται), since it was in that year that one became an expert in the solution of problems of legal interpretation.[59] But, in fact, one did not have to wait until the fourth year of law school to learn how to harmonize contradictory laws. The harmonization of *leges contrariae* was taught to students already at the stage of their rhetorical education.[60] The same subtlety — *qatīnūta* — that Severus advocates in the interpretation of the Fathers was considered a pre-

Orthodoxy in the *Cathedral Homilies*', which also argues for 'the importance of the juridical way of thinking on Severus' theology' (p. 488). Although Roux's focus is on the *Cathedral Homilies* and mine is on the anti-Julianist writings we come to essentially the same conclusions.

[56] Zachariah Scholasticus, *Vie de Sévère*, ed. by Kugener, p. 91. For the correct translation of this passage, *pace* Kugener, see Poggi, 'Severo di Antiochia', pp. 64–65.

[57] John of Beith Aphthonia, *Vie de Sévère*, ed. and trans. by Kugener, p. 131.

[58] See Poggi, 'Severo di Antiochia', pp. 65–67, for traces of some Roman laws in Severus's writings.

[59] Justinian I, *Digest*, ed. by Mommsen and Krueger, *Const. Omnem*, 5, vol. I, pp. lii–liii; see also Schulz, *History of Roman Legal Science*, p. 276.

[60] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, trans. by Butler 7. 7. 1–5, vol. III, pp. 142–45; Julius Victor, *Ars rhetorica* 3. 13, in *Rhetores Latini minores*, ed. by Halm, II, 323. See also Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, pp. 93–95.

requisite for teachers and exegetes of the law.[61] The Theodosian Code requires law professors to exhibit an *interpretandi subtilitas*,[62] and it is this same exegetical subtlety that Justinian declares needs to be applied in order to resolve any apparent contradictions in his *Digest* of Roman law:[63]

> As for any contradiction occurring in this book, none such has any claim to a place in it, nor will any be found, if one considers with subtle intelligence (*suptili animo*) the grounds of diversity (*diversitatis rationes*); some special differential feature will be discovered, however obscure, which does away with the imputation of inconsistency, puts a different complexion on the matter and keeps it outside the limits of discrepancy.

Written a generation after Severus's graduation from the Beirut law school, this passage captures the methodological assumptions and exegetical procedures that would have imbued Severus's legal studies.[64] This jurisprudential approach denies all possibility of development and contradiction within the canon, and it is markedly unhistorical. The canon is viewed as a flat surface, without perspective or background.[65] All categories employed in the interpretation of the text must be drawn from within the text's subject matter rather than from the circumstances of its composition and transmission. Fritz Schulz, the mid-twentieth century master of Roman jurisprudence, describes this as the 'classical approach', which he distinguishes from the 'historical approach':

> Both classicist and historian concentrate on the past. The historian seeks to recover past relations, to see and depict the past as it once actually was, in its historical conditions and its relative imperfection. The classicist seeks a standard; from some historical phenomenon, which he claims to have been a culminating achievement, he strives to derive a canon or norm for the present day. His constant tendency is therefore to rejuvenate the classical model and adapt it to the present day.[66]

Schulz's description of the legal classicism Severus imbibed in his formative years can equally be applied to the theological classicism he articulated in his mature years. Unlike his more historically minded predecessors — theologians

[61] See the passage cited at n. 35, above.

[62] Theodosios II, *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. by Krueger 6. 21, vol. 1, p. 206.

[63] Justinian I, *Digest*, ed. by Mommsen and Krueger, *Const. Tanta*, 15, vol. 1, p. lxi. My translation, however, is adapted from Justinian I, *Digest*, trans. by Monro, vol. 1, p. xxxii.

[64] For a detailed study of the terminology of the harmonization of legal contradictions by sixth-century Roman jurists, see Pringsheim, 'Beryt und Bologna', pp. 212–42.

[65] See Schulz, *History of Roman Legal Science*, p. 135.

[66] Schulz, *History of Roman Legal Science*, p. 279.

such as Athanasius, Basil and Cyril — Severus viewed the work of theology as centred on a canon of authoritative, post-biblical sources. Unlike his predecessors (who, ironically, were the very authors whom Severus canonized), and very much like his rabbinic contemporaries, the framers of the Babylonian Talmud, Severus allowed no place for 'historical conditions' and 'relative imperfection' in his interpretation of the past.[67] But as a result of their shared traditionalism both Severus and the Bavli often ended up adapting their respective traditions to present concerns, rather than the reverse.[68]

Severus did not invent the 'Church Fathers'. His fourth-and-fifth century predecessors had already appealed to certain teachers of the past as authoritative sources of the theological tradition.[69] What Severus did do was to *re*invent the Church Fathers. He helped institutionalize a canon of Fathers: a select, closed set of authorized texts conceived as an independent system devoid of conflict and change. I have suggested that the roots of Severus's new conception of the Fathers are to be found in the combined application of legal hermeneutics and biblical notions of divine inspiration.[70] But, as we have seen, Severus's institutionalization of the Fathers paradoxically also entailed a more individual approach to the Fathers, in which the son would exegetically shape his fathers in his own theological image.

[67] On the a-historical orientation of rabbinic legal thinking see Schwartz, 'From Alexandria to Rabbinic Literature to Zion' (Hebrew). I owe this reference to Vered Noam.

[68] My hypothesis of a shared legalistic background does not, however, explain why it was the Bavli *per se*, and not the Yerushalmi, that developed the characteristics under discussion. A possible solution may lie in the particular circumstances of the late fifth-sixth centuries, which might have favoured these types of 'totalizing' attitudes toward the past in different realms of discourse. See Gray, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress', pp. 288–89, for a step in this direction. Further investigation along these lines might help answer the question, raised by Kalmin, *Redaction of the Babylonian Talmud*, p. 94, as to why the anonymous redactor rose to prominence, as he argues, around the turn of the fifth and sixth centuries. See also Boyarin, 'Hellenism in Jewish Babylonia', pp. 339–42. For a different perspective, see Sussmann, 'Ve-shuv li-Yerushalmi Neziqin'.

[69] Graumann, *Die Kirche der Väter*, describes this process in detail. For a brief treatment of Cyril of Alexandria's role in the process, see also King, 'New Evidence on the Philoxenian Versions of the New Testament and Nicene Creed', pp. 9–10.

[70] A comparison to canonization processes in rabbinic literature is interesting here. According to Alexander, *Transmitting Mishnah*, p. 115, it was reading practices predicated on assumptions of the text's perfection and relevance that led, as a secondary historical development, to the notion of the text's divine origin, rather than the reverse. Severus, conversely, argues for his harmonizing readings of the fathers on the basis of his claim that all the fathers speak in the one voice of the holy spirit.

Works Cited

Manuscripts and Archival Resources

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Syr. 140

Primary Sources

Athanasius, *Athanasius von Alexandrien: De Sententia Dionysii; Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, ed. and trans. by Uta Heil (Berlin, 1999)

——, *De Sententia Dionysii — Admonitio*, in *Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols (1857–66), xxv (1857), cols 477–520

Basil, 'Letter 210', in *Saint Basil: The Letters*, ed. and trans. by Roy J. Deferrari, Loeb Classical Library, 4 vols (London, 1926–34), iii, 206–09

Clavis patrum Graecorum, ed. by Maurice Geerard and others, 6 vols (Turnhout, 1974–2003)
i: *Patres antenicaeni, schedulis usi quibus rem paravit* (1983)
ii: *Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum* (1974)
iii: *A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum* (1979; 2nd edn 2003)
iv: *Concilia: catenae* (1980)
v: *Indices, initia, concordantiae, cura et studio M. Geerard et F. Glorie* (1987)
vi: *Supplementum cura et studio M. Geerard et J. Noret* (1998)

Codex Theodosianus, ed. by Paul Krueger, 2 vols (Berlin, 1923–26)

Cyprian of Carthage, *Sententiae Episcoporum numero lxxxvii de haereticis baptizandis*, ed. by Gerardus Frederik Diercks, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 3E (Turnhout, 2004)

Cyril of Alexandria, *Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in Joannis Evangelium*, ed. by Philip E. Pusey, 3 vols (Oxford, 1872)

——, *De recta fide ad augustas*, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* i*: Concilium Universale Ephesenum (ad 431)*, ed. by Eduard Schwartz, 5 vols (Berlin, 1922–29), i. 1.5: *Collectio Vaticana* (1927–28), pp. 26–61

——, *De recta fide ad augustas, in Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols (1857–66), lxxvi (1859), cols 994–1096

——, *Epistolæ sancti Cyrilli et variorum ad ipsum*, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum i: Concilium Universale Ephesenum (ad 431)*, ed. by Eduard Schwartz, 5 vols (Berlin, 1922–29), i: *Collectio Vaticana* (1927–28)

——, *Epistolæ sancti Cyrilli et variorum ad ipsum*, in *Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols (1857–66), lxxvii (1859), cols 9–390

——, *Epistolæ sancti Cyrilli et variorum ad ipsum*, trans. by John McGuckin, in *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts* (Crestwood, 2004)

Irenaeus, *Eis epideixin tou apostolikou kerygmatos = The Proof of the Apostolic Preaching: With Seven Fragments*, ed. and trans. by Karapet Ter Meḳĕrttschian, Samuel Graham Wilson, and Joseph Barthoulot, Patrologia Orientalis, 12.5 (Turnhout, 1974)

John Chrysostom, *Homilia in illud, Pater, si possibile est, transeat a me calix iste*, in *Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols (1857–66), LI (1862), cols 29–37

——, *Homiliae in Joannem*, in *Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols (1857–66), LIX (1862), cols 21–477

John of Beith Aphthonia, *Vie de Sévère*, ed. and trans. by Marc-Antoine Kugener, Patrologia Orientalis, 2.3 (Paris, 1907)

Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, ed. by Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone* (Berlin and New York, 1997)

Justinian I, *The Digest of Justinian*, trans. by Charles Henry Monro, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1904–09)

——, *The Digest of Justinian*, ed. by Theodor Mommsen and Paul Krueger, trans. by Alan Watson, 4 vols (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985)

Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. by Harold Edgeworth Butler, Loeb Classical Library, 4 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1920–22)

Rhetores Latini minores, ed. by Karl Halm, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1863)

Severus of Antioch, *Oratio prima et secunda*, in *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Lebon, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 93–94, 101–02, 111–12, 6 vols (Leuven, 1929–38)

——, *La Polémique antijulianiste*, ed. and trans. by Robert Hespel, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 244–45, 295–96, 301–302, 318–19, 3 vols in 4 (Leuven, 1964–71)

Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, ed. and trans. by Ernest Evans, Oxford Early Christian Texts, 2 vols (Oxford, 1972)

Zachariah Scholasticus, *Vie de Sévère*, ed. by Marc-Antoine Kugener, Patrologia Orientalis, 2.1 (Paris, 1907)

Secondary Studies

Alexander, Elizabeth Shanks, 'The Orality of Rabbinic Writing', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. by Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 38–57

——, *Transmitting Mishnah: The Shaping Influence of Oral Tradition* (Cambridge, 2006)

Beeley, Christopher A., 'Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen: Tradition and Complexity in Patristic Christology', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 17 (2009), 381–419

Bernardini, Paolo, *Un solo battesimo una sola chiesa: il Concilio di Cartagine del settembre 256* (Bologna, 2009)

Boyarin, Daniel, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia, 2004)

——, 'Hellenism in Jewish Babylonia', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. by Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 336–63

Burns, James Patout, *Cyprian the Bishop* (London, 2002)
Casey, Robert P., 'Julian of Halicarnassus', *Harvard Theological Review*, 19 (1926), 206–13
Daley, Brian E., 'Boethius' Theological Tracts and Early Byzantine Scholasticism', *Mediaeval Studies*, 46 (1984), 158–91
Destephen, Sylvain, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, 3 vols (Paris, 1982–2008)
Draguet, René, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ* (Louvain, 1924)
Ehrman, Bart D., *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York, 1993)
Epstein, Ya'aḳov Naḥum, *Introduction to the Text of the Mishnah* (Jerusalem, 1948)
Fisch, Menachem, 'Parshanut dekhuka ve'tekstim makhayvim: Ha'ukimta ha'amorait ve'hafilosofiyah shel ha'halakhah', in *'Iyunim ḥadashim ba-filosofyah shel ha-halakhah*, ed. by Aviezer Ravitzky and Avinoam Rosenak (Jerusalem, 2008), pp. 311–44
——, *Rational Rabbis: Science and Talmudic Culture* (Bloomington, 1997)
Frend, William H. C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge, 1972)
Friedman, Shamma, 'Pereq haisha rabbah babavli', in *Meḥḳarim u-meḳorot: me'asef le-mada'e ha-Yahadut*, ed. by Hayim Zalman Dimitrovsky, 2 vols in 3 (New York, 1977), pp. 283–321
Graumann, Thomas, *Die Kirche der Väter: Vätertheologie und Väterbeweis in den Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)* (Tübingen, 2002)
Gray, Patrick T. R., 'Down the Tunnel with Leontius of Jerusalem: The Sixth-Century Transformation of Theology', in *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?* ed. by Pauline Allen and Elizabeth Jeffreys, Byzantina Australiensia, 10 (Brisbane, 1996), pp. 187–96
——, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress: Reconstructing the Theological Tradition in the Sixth Century', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 81 (1988), 284–89
——, '"The Select Fathers": Canonizing the Patristic Past', *Studia Patristica*, 23 (1989), 21–36
Grillmeier, Aloys, and Theresia Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, trans. by John Cawte and Pauline Allen, 2 vols (London, 1995), II. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*
Halbertal, Moshe, *People of the Book: Canon, Meaning and Authority* (Cambridge, MA, 1997)
Halivni, David, *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara: The Jewish Predilection for Justified Law* (Cambridge, MA, 1986)
——, *Meqorot u-mesorot: be'urim bat-talmud has-seder mo"ed miy-yoma "ad hagiga*, 6 vols (Jerusalem, 1968–2003)
Hayes, Christine, *Between the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds: Accounting for Halakhic Difference in Selected Sugyot from Tractate Avodah Zarah* (Oxford, 1997)
Honigmann, Ernest, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 127, Subsidia, 2 (Leuven, 1951)
Jaffee, Martin S., 'Rabbinic Authorship as a Collective Enterprise', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. by Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 17–37

Kalmin, Richard, 'The Formation and Character of the Babylonian Talmud', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. by William David Davies and Louis Finkelstein (Cambridge, 1984–2006), IV: *The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*, ed. by Steven T. Katz (2008), pp. 840–76

——, *Redaction of the Babylonian Talmud: Amoraic or Saboraic?* (Cincinnati, 1989)

King, Daniel, 'New Evidence on the Philoxenian Versions of the New Testament and the Nicene Creed', *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies*, 13 (2010), 9–30

Kraemer, David, *The Mind of the Talmud: An Intellectual History of the Bavli* (Oxford, 1990)

Lang, Uwe Michael, *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon in the Sixth Century: A Study and Translation of the Arbiter* (Leuven, 2001)

Lausberg, Heinrich, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, ed. by David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson, trans. by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton (Leiden, 1998)

Lim, Richard, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1995)

McGuckin, John, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts* (Crestwood, 2004)

Menze, Volker L., *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* (Oxford, 2008)

Meunier, Bernard, *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie: l'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite* (Paris, 1997)

Mingana, Alphonse, 'New Documents on Philoxenus of Hierapolis and on the Philoxenian Version of the Bible', *The Expositor,* 19 (1920), 149–60

Moss, Yonatan S., 'In Corruption: Severus of Antioch on the Body of Christ' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, 2013)

Poggi, Vincenzo, 'Severo di Antiochia alla Scuola di Beirut', in *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*, ed. by Massimiliano Pavan and Umberto Cozzoli (Firenze, 1986), pp. 57–71

Pringsheim, Fritz, 'Beryt und Bologna', in *Festschrift für Otto Lenel zum funfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläum am 16 Dezember 1921* (Leipzig, 1921), pp. 204–85

Rebillard, Éric, 'A New Style of Argument in Christian Polemic: Augustine and the Use of Patristic Citations', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 8 (2000), 559–78

Roux, René, 'The Concept of Orthodoxy in the *Cathedral Homilies* of Severus of Antioch', *Studia Patristica*, 35 (2001), 488–93

——, *L'exégèse biblique dans les Homélies Cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche* (Roma, 2002)

Rubenstein, Jeffrey L., *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud* (Baltimore, 2003)

Schulz, Fritz, *History of Roman Legal Science* (Oxford, 1946)

Schwartz, Daniel R., 'From Alexandria to Rabbinic Literature to Zion: The Jews' Departure from History, and Who Is It Who Returns to It?', in *Zionism and the Return to History: A Reappraisal*, ed. by Segun N. Eisenstadt and Moshe Lissak (Jerusalem, 1995), pp. 40–55

Smyth, Herbert W., *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York, 1920)

Studer, Basil, 'Argumentation, Patristic', in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. by Angelo di Berardino, trans. by Adrian Walford, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1992), I: *A–M*, p. 72

Sussmann, Yaacov, 'Ve-shuv li-Yerushalmi Neziqin', in *Meḥḳare Talmud*, ed. by Yaacov Sussman and David Rosenthal, 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1990), I, 55–133

Vasiliev, Alexander Aleksandrovic, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great* (Cambridge, MA, 1950)

Vessey, Mark, 'The Forging of Orthodoxy in Latin Christian Literature: A Case Study', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 4 (1996), 495–513

Wallace-Hadrill, David Sutherland, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge, 1982)

Wessel, Susan, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy* (Oxford, 2004)